

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-30 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-19, 21-24, and 26-30 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled, its subject matter incorporated into independent Claims 1 and 30. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, in light of the above amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The Specification has been amended to add section headings pursuant to the Examiner's request.

Claims 1 and 30 have been amended to address objections set forth in the September 23 Office Action. More specifically, amendments have been made to address matters of form and grammar. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former Claim 2, which is now canceled. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-19, 21-24, and 26-29 have been amended to address matters of form and grammar, and to be in accordance with U.S. practice. Support for amendments made to each claim are found throughout the Specification and Drawings, as filed, for example, in each respective claim.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Office Action states that "the amendment to the claims filed on October 28, 2003 does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(c) because a clean copy of the amended claims has not been provided. Amendments to the claims filed on or after July 30, 2003 must comply with 37 CFR 1.121(c)." Applicants respectfully submit that 37 CFR 1.121 was changed effective July 30, 2003 eliminating the requirement to supply a clean copy of amended claims. The amendment referred to by the Office Action was filed after (October 28, 2003) the

effective date of the change. In any event, Applicants believe that the present set of claims, set forth above, satisfy all requirements of 37 CFR 1.121.

The Office Action has objected to the Specification for not including Section headings. As set forth above, the Specification has been amended to insert these headings, where appropriate. Applicants believe this objection is now obviated.

#### Claim Objections

The claims have been objected to because of grammatical errors (i.e. "towards" should be rendered "toward" with regards to plurality). As amended, Applicants respectfully submit that the indicated grammatical errors have been corrected. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that this objection has been obviated.

Claim 1 has been objected to because of an informality. The examiner has requested a revised claim with "no embedded preamble and transitional statements." As amended, Applicants believe that the above-described objection has been obviated.

Claim 7 has been objected to, the Office Action stating, "It is unclear exactly how the reflection face is obtained by anamorphosis. Anamorphosis primarily deals with distorted projections or images that must be viewed at a specific angle or with a special instrument to render a clear representation. How then can a reflection face be obtained with anamorphosis? It is conceivable that a projection a light ray could perhaps undergo anamorphosis for the purpose of wider distribution." Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to Applicants' Specification at page 20, line 25 through page 21, line 24, which describes how the reflection face can be obtained by anamorphosis. Applicants believe that this section of Applicants' Specification should clarify the above-described objections of the Examiner.

Claim 29 has been objected to because of informalities. Specifically, in line 3 "the" had been twice recited. Claim 29 has been amended to delete the redundant word "the." The Office Action further objects to Claim 29 by stating, "Nowhere in the specification does the applicant show said light engine integrated in the light source. It would seem the vice versa whereby the light source is integrated in the light engine." Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to Figure 15 and the description thereof in the Specification at page 34, lines 11-19. Applicants believe that this should obviate the above objection.

As now claimed, Applicants' invention (Claim 1) is directed to an indicator lamp, for a motor vehicle, comprising: a light source arranged along an optical axis oriented from the rear to the front of the indicator lamp for emitting light rays toward the front, at a solid angle centered on the axis; and an optical device for recovering and distributing the rays of light emitted by the source for providing, toward the front, an indicating function, the optical device having: a coaxial annular reflector; and a light engine in front of the light source for distributing the rays of light emitted by the light source in directions that are generally transverse about the optical axis, toward the coaxial annular reflector that is provided for distributing the rays of light, coming from the light engine, toward the front, generally in a direction parallel to the optical axis, so as to provide the indicating function, said light engine being made of a transparent material having a refractive index greater than that of air, and having: an inlet face which is arranged axially opposite the light source and having a profile, in axial section, such that most of the rays of light emitted by the source penetrate into the light engine; an outlet face which is arranged generally radially opposite at least one axial section of the coaxial annular reflector; at least one front inner reflection face which is provided to deflect at least part of the rays of light

that enter the light engine, toward the outlet face, such that the rays of light leave the light engine by way of the outlet face by being refracted, and such that these rays of light strike the coaxial annular reflector at given angles of incidence; and a rear inner reflection face of concave parabolic annular shape, which is focused on the light source and which reflects the rays of light axially toward the front.

In another aspect, Applicants' invention (Claim 10) is directed to an indicator lamp having an optical axis extending from a first end portion to a second end portion, the lamp comprising: a light source disposed so as to emit light rays toward the second end portion along said axis; a coaxial annular reflector; and a light engine disposed downstream of the light source for distributing said light rays in directions that are generally transverse about the optical axis toward the coaxial annular reflector, the light engine being made of a transparent material having a refractive index greater than that of air, the light engine including: an inlet face which is arranged axially opposite the light source and having a profile in axial section, is such that most of the rays of light emitted by the source penetrate into the light engine; an outlet face which is arranged generally radially opposite at least one axial section of the coaxial annular reflector; at least one front inner reflection face which is provided to deflect at least part of the rays of light that enter the light engine toward the outlet face, such that the rays of light leave the light engine by way of the outlet face by being refracted, and such that these rays of light strike the coaxial annular reflector at given angles of incidence; and a rear inner reflection face of concave parabolic annular shape, which is focused on the light source and which reflects the rays of light axially toward the front.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Former Claims 1, 5, 13, 15, 20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0024818) (“Kondo”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection

Kondo describes a lighting device for altering the light output from a LED.

Independent Claims 1 and 30 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former Claim 2, which has been canceled. As amended, Independent Claims 1 and 30 recite “a rear inner reflection face of concave parabolic annular shape, which is focused on the light source and which reflects the rays of light axially toward the front,” which is not taught or suggested by Kondo.

Moreover, the Office Action refers to the embodiment of Figure 4 of Kondo in rejecting the above claims. However, the inlet face (7b) of that embodiment does not collect most of the light rays from the source due to its relatively narrow opening angle. Additionally, the distance of the light source from the inlet face worsens this problem in Kondo.

For these reasons, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 30 define patentable subject matter over Kondo. Withdrawal of the rejection applied to former Claims 1, 5, 13, 15, 20 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Zwick et al. (U.S. Patent 5582480)

(“Zwick”). As set forth above, Claim 2 has been canceled and its subject matter incorporated into independent Claims 1 and 30.

The deficiencies of Kondo are set forth above. Zwick does not remedy these deficiencies. Zwick was relied upon for allegedly teaching a rear reflection face of concave parabolic shape that is focused about a light source.

The Office Action argues “Kondo further teaches the optical component/light engine having a rear inner reflection face [Figure 3: (4b)] of concave parabolic shape, which is focused on the light source and reflects light axially towards the front.” See Office Action at page 6. However, element 4b in Kondo is not “focused on the light source,” which is indicated by the dot below the Figure. If anything, element 4b is focused on element 4c (or the center thereof). It is *not* the light source itself, as claimed by Applicants.

Zwick describes a light assembly utilizing a conventional light bulb (5), various reflectors (8, 11, 12) and a prism (17). In contrast with Kondo, a LED is not used. Accordingly, light in Zwick from the light bulb (5) is directed in virtually every direction, the obvious exception being the direction beyond its base. Light, therefore, also is directed backward and to the sides. LEDs, such as that used in Kondo on the other hand, typically have a very narrow forward-oriented beam spread, and essentially no light is directed backward or to the sides of the LED, thus eliminating a need for such a reflector. Thus, Kondo does not teach or suggest any need for a reflector, such as that of Zwick proposed by the Office Action.

Moreover, Kondo teaches away from combination with Zwick. According to Kondo, the light output from the LED utilized therein is adequately handled by the devices described therein. No need for an additional reflector to the sides of the LED is taught or suggested. The Office Action appears to agree that there is no need for alterations of Kondo with

the teachings of Zwick. The Office Action states, “It should be noted that Kondo compensates for light first reflected off a rear face whereby a hyperboloid design is implemented to efficiently receive and utilize the light from a light source [Pages 1&2, Paragraphs 18-26], and *thereby eliminating a need for such a reflector*” (emphasis added). See Office Action at page 6, lines 1-15. Since Kondo teaches away from combination with Zwick, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Kondo and Zwick is not obvious, and that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Finally, even in a device combining the teachings of Kondo and Zwick, assuming such a combination were proper (which Applicants submit is not), such a device would still suffer from an the inlet face (7b) that does not collect most of the light rays from the source due to its relatively narrow opening angle, with the distance of the light source from the inlet face worsening this problem.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of former Claim 2, and therefore also the subject matter of amended Claims 1 and 30, define patentable subject matter over Kondo and Zwick, considered alone or in combination. Since Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter, any claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter, including dependent Claims 3 and 4. Withdrawal of the rejection applied to former Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Zwick is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo. Since each of these claims depends from independent Claim 1, which for the foregoing reasons defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, these claims also define patentable subject matter over Kondo. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo as applied to Claim 3 above, and further in view of Torguet (U.S. Patent 3799652). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claim 7 defines patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo and Torguet. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Zwick et al. as applied to Claim 2 above, and further in view of Carel (U.S. Patent 4177505). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo and Zwick, considered alone or in combination, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo and Zwick, considered alone or in combination. Accordingly, Claims 9-12 define patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo, Zwick and Carel. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Serizawa (U.S. Publication 2002/0034081). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claims 17-18 define patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo and Serizawa. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Serizawa as applied to Claim 17 above, and further in view of Lehman (U.S. Patent 1897202). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over



Kondo. Accordingly, Claim 19 defines patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo and Serizawa. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-22 and 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferrero (U.S. Patent 4263641). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claims 21-22 and 23-24 define patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo and Ferrero. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25, 26 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Ferrero as applied to Claim 24 above, and further in view of Gotou (U.S. Publication 2001/0010636). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claims 25, 26 and 28 define patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo, Ferrero and Gotou. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Ferrero as applied to Claim 23 above, and further in view of Carel (U.S. Patent 4177505). Since independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claim 27 defines patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo, Ferrero and Carel. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Bitner (U.S. Patent 2215900). Since

independent Claim 1 defines patentable subject matter over Kondo, as set forth above, every claim depending therefrom also defines patentable subject matter over Kondo. Accordingly, Claim 29 defines patentable subject matter over a combination of Kondo and Bitner.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims, as currently presented, define patentable subject matter over the art of record. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1948-4823. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1948-4823. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 23, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Pollack  
Registration No. 53,475

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700 Telephone  
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile